IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Case No. 2:22-cv-00187

PREPARED FOOD PHOTOS, INC. f/k/a ADLIFE MARKETING & COMMUNICATIONS CO., INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GREAT LAKES FOODS, LLC d/b/a LADYSMITH FRESH MARKET,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Prepared Food Photos, Inc. f/k/a Adlife Marketing & Communications Co., Inc. ("Plaintiff") sues Great Lakes Foods, LLC d/b/a Ladysmith Fresh Market ("Defendant") and alleges as follows:

THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Florida with its principal place of business located in Broward County, Florida.
- 2. Defendant is a limited liability company organized and existing under the laws of the State of Wisconsin with its principal place of business located at 962 1st Street, Menominee, MI 49858. Defendant's agent for service of process is G&K Wisconsin Services, LLC, 200 S. Washington Street, Suite 100, Green Bay, WI 54301.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

4. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it maintained sufficient minimum contacts with Michigan such that the exercise of personal jurisdiction over it would not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

5. Venue properly lies in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1400(a) because Defendant or its agents reside or may be found in this district. "[A]n individual defendant 'may be found' in any federal district in which he or she is subject to personal jurisdiction." J4 Promotions, Inc. v. Splash Dogs, LLC, No. 08 CV 977, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11023, at *79 (N.D. Ohio Feb. 13, 2009). In other words, venue is proper in his District because Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District. See Big Guy's Pinball, LLC v. Lipham, No. 14-CV-14185, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89512, at *2 (E.D. Mich. July 10, 2015).

FACTS

I. Plaintiff's Business

- 6. Plaintiff is in the business of licensing high-end, professional photographs for the food industry.
- 7. Through its commercial website (www.preparedfoodphotos.com), Plaintiff offers a monthly subscription service which provides access to/license of tens of thousands of professional images.
- 8. As of the date of this pleading, Plaintiff charges its clients (generally, grocery stores, restaurant chains, food service companies, etc.) a monthly fee of \$999.00 for access to its library of professional photographs.
- 9. Plaintiff does not license individual photographs or otherwise make individual photographs available for purchase. Plaintiff's business model relies on its recurring monthly subscription service such that Plaintiff can continue to maintain its impressive portfolio.

10. Plaintiff owns each of the photographs available for license on its website and serves as the licensing agent with respect to licensing such photographs for limited use by Plaintiff's customers. To that end, Plaintiff's standard terms include a limited, non-transferable license for use of any photograph by the customer only. Plaintiff's license terms make clear that all copyright ownership remains with Plaintiff and that its customers are not permitted to transfer, assign, or sub-license any of Plaintiff's photographs to another person/entity.

II. The Work at Issue in this Lawsuit

11. In 2001, a professional photographer created a photograph titled "ColbyJackCheeseHC1102". A copy of the Work is exhibited below:



- 12. The Work was registered by Plaintiff (pursuant to a work-for-hire agreement with the author that transferred all rights and title in the photograph to Plaintiff) with the Register of Copyrights on June 9, 2017 and was assigned Registration No. VA 2-055-131. A true and correct copy of the Certification of Registration pertaining to the Work is attached hereto as **Exhibit "A."**
- 13. Plaintiff is the owner of the Work and has remained the owner at all times material hereto.

III. Defendant's Unlawful Activities

- 14. Defendant is a grocery offering meat, produce, baked and frozen goods, and other services.
 - 15. In 2019, Defendant purchased the supermarket through a court-approved sale.
- 16. Defendant advertises/markets its business primarily through its commercial websites (https://www.ladysmithfreshmarket.com/, https://www.greatlakesfoods.com/), social media (e.g. https://www.facebook.com/greatlakesfoods/, https://www.linkedin.com/company/great-lakesfoods/), and other forms of advertising.
- 17. Upon information and belief, Defendant located a copy of the Work on the internet and, rather than contact Plaintiff to secure a license, simply copied the Work for its own commercial use.
- 18. On a date after Plaintiff's above-referenced copyright registration of the Work,

 Defendant published the Work on its website (at

 https://s3.grocerywebsite.com/production/pdf ad images/64851/original/Ladysmith 13.pdf):



19. A true and correct copy of a weekly flyer from Defendant's website, displaying the copyrighted Work, is attached hereto as **Exhibit "B."**

20. Defendant is not and has never been licensed to use or display the Work. Defendant

never contacted Plaintiff to seek permission to use the Work in connection with its advertising or

for any other purpose – even though the Work that was copied is clearly professional stock

photography that would put Defendant on notice that the Work was not intended for public use.

21. Defendant utilized the Work for commercial use – namely, in connection with the

marketing of its grocery.

22. Through its ongoing diligent efforts to identify unauthorized use of its photographs,

Plaintiff first discovered the aforementioned unauthorized use/display of the Work in June 2022.

Following Plaintiff's discovery, Plaintiff notified Defendant in writing of such unauthorized use.

To date, Plaintiff has been unable to negotiate a reasonable license for the past/existing

infringement of its Work.

COUNT I – COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT

23. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates paragraphs 1 through 22 as set forth above.

24. The Work is an original work of authorship, embodying copyrightable subject

matter, that is subject to the full protection of the United States copyright laws (17 U.S.C. § 101 et

seq.).

25. Plaintiff owns a valid copyright in the Work, having registered the Work with the

Register of Copyrights and owning sufficient rights, title, and interest to such copyright to afford

Plaintiff standing to bring this lawsuit and assert the claim(s) herein.

26. As a result of Plaintiff's reproduction, distribution, and public display of the Work,

Defendant had access to the Work prior to its own reproduction, distribution, and public display

of the Work on Defendant's website.

27. Defendant reproduced, distributed, and publicly displayed the Work without

5

authorization from Plaintiff.

28. By its actions, Defendant infringed and violated Plaintiff's exclusive rights in

violation of the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 501, by reproducing, distributing, and publicly

displaying the Work for its own commercial purposes.

29. Defendant's infringement was willful as it acted with actual knowledge or reckless

disregard for whether its conduct infringed upon Plaintiff's copyright. Notably, Defendant itself

utilizes a copyright disclaimer on its website ("© 2022"), indicating that Defendant understands

the importance of copyright protection and intellectual property.

30. Plaintiff has been damaged as a direct and proximate result of Defendant's

infringement.

31. Plaintiff is entitled to recover its actual damages resulting from Defendant's

unauthorized use of the Work and, at Plaintiff's election (pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), Plaintiff

is entitled to recover damages based on a disgorgement of Defendant's profits from infringement

of the Work, which amounts shall be proven at trial.

32. Alternatively, and at Plaintiff's election, Plaintiff is entitled to statutory damages

pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(c), in such amount as deemed proper by the Court.

33. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505, Plaintiff is further entitled to recover its costs and

attorneys' fees as a result of Defendant's conduct.

34. Defendant's conduct has caused and any continued infringing conduct will continue

to cause irreparable injury to Plaintiff unless enjoined by the Court. Plaintiff has no adequate

remedy at law. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 502, Plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction

prohibiting infringement of Plaintiff's exclusive rights under copyright law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:

6

COPYCAT LEGAL PLLC 3111 N. UNIVERSITY DRIVE, SUITE 301 • CORAL SPRINGS, FL 33065 TELEPHONE (877) 437-6228 a. A declaration that Defendant has infringed Plaintiff's copyrights in the Work;

b. A declaration that such infringement is willful;

c. An award of actual damages and disgorgement of profits as the Court deems proper or, at

Plaintiff's election, an award of statutory damages for willful infringement up to

\$150,000.00 for each infringement of the Work;

d. Awarding Plaintiff its costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505;

e. Awarding Plaintiff interest, including prejudgment interest, on the foregoing amounts;

f. Permanently enjoining Defendant, its employees, agents, officers, directors, attorneys,

successors, affiliates, subsidiaries and assigns, and all those in active concert and

participation with Defendant, from directly or indirectly infringing Plaintiff's copyrights

or continuing to display, transfer, advertise, reproduce, or otherwise market any works

derived or copied from the Work or to participate or assist in any such activity; and

g. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Demand For Jury Trial

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all issued so triable.

Dated: September 26, 2022.

COPYCAT LEGAL PLLC

3111 N. University Drive

Suite 301

Coral Springs, FL 33065

Telephone: (877) 437-6228

dan@copycatlegal.com

By: /s/ Daniel DeSouza, Esq.

Daniel DeSouza, Esq.